

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 13 and 18 have been canceled, and claims 12 and 17 have been amended. Support for the amendments is provided in paragraphs [0064] and [0069]-[0071] of the published specification. (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

Claims 12-15 and 17-20 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 2003/0225512) in view of Ooe (US 6,330,238). To the extent that these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse as follows.

Claim 12 now defines a broadcast data receiving terminal that stores information indicating that displaying received broadcast notification information is unnecessary if broadcast data has been received and that displaying the broadcast notification information is necessary if the broadcast data has not been received. The claimed subject matter provides an advantage of deciding, every time broadcast notification information is received, whether to display received broadcast notification information.

Kim discloses, in Fig. 2, selecting 203 road traffic information corresponding to identification (ID) information of a road identified within a received broadcast message and displaying 205 the selected road traffic information (see Kim paragraph [0054], lines 1-4, and paragraph [0066], lines 1-9)). Nowhere does Kim disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter of information indicating that displaying received broadcast notification information is

unnecessary if broadcast data has been received and that displaying the broadcast notification information is necessary if the broadcast data has not been received.

Ooe discloses, in Fig. 1B, determining whether a multicast address exists in a storage table (see Ooe col. 7, lines 4-11). If the multicast address exists in the table, then a request for transmission of multicast data is issued to a transmitting node; otherwise, the transmitting node is informed that such transmission is unnecessary (see col. 7, lines 12-16 and 26-30). Nowhere does Ooe disclose information indicating that displaying a received broadcast notification is unnecessary if a first condition is met and necessary if a second condition is met.

By contrast to the Applicants' claimed subject matter of displaying received broadcast notification information in accordance with a specific condition, Ooe discloses that a node transmits a data request to another node in accordance with a specific condition. In addition, the Applicants' claimed condition differs from Ooe's condition. Applicants' claims 12 and 17 recite the condition of whether data is received, whereas Ooe discloses the condition of whether a multicast address exists within a storage table.

In summary, Kim and Ooe, considered alone or together, do not suggest the claimed subject matter of information indicating that displaying received broadcast notification information is unnecessary if broadcast data has been received and that displaying the broadcast notification information is necessary if the broadcast data has not been received.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that even if Kim and Ooe were combined as proposed in the Office Action, the result still would lack at least the above-noted features of claim 12, and thus, these references, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 12. Independent claim 17 now similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 12 from the applied references, but with

respect to a method. Therefore, allowance of claims 12 and 17 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: September 18, 2009  
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter  
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06176  
Dickinson Wright PLLC  
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 659-6966  
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559